

09/727,191

MS150809.01/MSFTP177US

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-41 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 3, 15, 22, 24, 26, 27, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, and 41 have been amended as shown at pp. 2-8 of this Reply.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

**I. Objection to Claim 23**

Claim 23 is objected to because it is cancelled yet the claim text is not deleted. The text of claim 23 has been deleted; therefore, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

**II. Objection to Claim 24 and 25**

Claims 24 and 25 are objected to because they depend on a cancelled claim. Claims 24 and 25 have been amended to correct this deficiency; and withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

**III. Objection to Claim 40**

Claim 40 is objected to because it depends on a cancelled claim. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in view of the herein amendments to this claim.

**IV. Objection to Claim 13**

Claim 13 is objected to because it is incorrectly numbered as claim 15. This deficiency has been corrected - withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

**V. Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 12, 22-23, 26-27, 35-38 and 40-41 Under 35 U.S.C §112**

Claims 1, 3, 12, 22-23, 26-27, 35-38 and 40-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, because the Officer Action asserts the claims are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention because of employment of "and/or" language.

09/727,191

MS150809.01/MSFTP177US

Claim 12 does not use "and/or" and claims 1, 3, 22-23, 26-27, 35-38 and 40-41 have been amended to remove the use of "and/or" within the claim limitations. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**V. Rejection of Claims 1, 3-7, 10-22, 24-38 and 40-41 Under 35 U.S.C §103(a)**

Claims 1, 3-7, 10-22, 24-38 and 40-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a), as being anticipated by Courts *et al.* (U.S. 6,076,108) in view of Hayton (U.S. 6,799,209). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. The cited references do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of applicants' claimed invention.

To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *See* MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *See In re Vaack*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The subject invention relates to managing states and user context information over a stateless protocol. Applicants' claimed invention employs identifiers to locate user context objects: a globally unique identifier, a locale identifier, a mailbox identifier and a security identifier. The invention can dynamically manage resources associated with user sessions by monitoring activity associated with memory and resources allocated to the user session. In particular, as recited in amended independent claim 1 (and similarly recited in independent claims 22, 36, 38 and 41), the claimed invention can reclaim resources allocated to the user context object upon determination that the user context object has not been accessed within a pre-determined threshold period of time. *The pre-determined threshold period of time can be*

09/727,191

MS150809.01/MSFTP177US

***dynamically changed based, at least in part, on feedback concerning the usage of one or more user context objects.***

As conceded in the Office Action Courts, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest the aforementioned novel aspects of applicants' invention as recited in the subject claims. Contrary to assertions in the Office Action regarding claim 15, from where the newly added limitation to the independent claims were taken, Hayton also fails to teach or suggest a pre-determined threshold period of time that can be dynamically changed based, at least in part, on feedback concerning usage of one or more user context objects as in the claimed invention. The sections of Hayton referenced in the Office Action refer to how the predetermined threshold of time is used to determine whether a user is active or inactive. Hayton teaches either counting from zero to a predetermined maximum value or counting from the pre-determined maximum value to zero to determine inactivity. Hayton further notes that the predetermined maximum value is user selectable, and also indicates that the user selectable period of time can be set to the pre-determined maximum value in the operating system if the operating system of the client is monitoring the level of activity - this is only a description of where the monitoring activity is taking place. Hayton does not teach or suggest that the predetermined maximum value is dynamically adjusted based upon feedback concerning level of activity. Hayton refers to feedback in terms of a screensaver that reminds the user that they have an idle server connection established. In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Courts, *et al.* and Hayton, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a pre-determined threshold period of time that can be dynamically changed based, at least in part, on feedback concerning usage of one or more user context objects as in applicants' claimed invention.

Claims 12 and 27 recite ***locating a user context object via an addressing algorithm, the algorithm employing the globally unique identifier, a locale identifier, a mailbox identifier and a security identifier.*** Contrary to contentions in the Office Action, Courts, *et al.* does not disclose locating the user context object via a globally unique identifier, a locale identifier, a mailbox identifier and a security identifier. The Office Action, Response to Arguments section asserts that Courts, *et al.* uses a security identifier to locate a user. However, applicants' claimed invention uses a combination of all four identifiers to locate a user context object. Courts, *et al.* does not use the four identifiers recited in the claim in combination. Moreover, Courts, *et al.* only discloses a session identifier and fails to disclose a globally unique identifier, a locale

09/727,191

MS150809.01/MSFTP177US

identifier, a mailbox identifier and a security identifier. Furthermore, Hayton also fails to mention or suggest the four identifiers recited in the claim. Courts, *et al.* and Hayton, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest locating a user context object via an addressing algorithm, the algorithm employing the globally unique identifier, a locale identifier, a mailbox identifier and a security identifier.

In view of at least the above, applicants' representative respectfully submits that Courts, *et al.* and Hayton, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all limitations of applicants' invention as recited in independent claims 1, 22, 36, 38 and 41 (and all claims that depend there from), and thus fails to make obvious the subject claimed invention. This rejection should be withdrawn.

#### CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP177US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP



Himanshu S. Amin  
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP  
24<sup>TH</sup> Floor, National City Center  
1900 E. 9<sup>TH</sup> Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile (216) 696-8731